

P16793

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application and Claims 1-28 stand rejected. Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, 20, 24 and 27 have been canceled herein without prejudice to the filing of continuations or divisionals, while Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 25 and 28 have been amended herein to further clarify the scope of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26 and 28 in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-20 and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Simpson ("Simpson" U.S. Publication No. 2004/0266399) in view of French-St. George et al. ("George" U.S. Patent No. 6,122,348). Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

First and foremost, Applicants respectfully highlight the fact that Claims 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, 20, 24 and 27 have been canceled herein and all rejections to these claims are hereby moot. With respect to the remaining claims pending in the application (Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26 and 28), Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position that the combination of Simpson and George renders the pending claims unpatentable. Specifically, the Examiner suggests that Simpson discloses all elements of the independent claims, but concedes that Simpson fails to disclose receiving notification of the incoming call on a data processing device that is externally connected to the cell phone. The Examiner submits, however, that George teaches a detection of an alert from an incoming call while user is on the computer, where the computer is connected to the server 115. As such, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of George and Simpson for the benefit of achieving a communication system that uses multiple media options to manage incoming communication event(s). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As previously discussed in the Preliminary Amendment submitted on March 17, 2006, Simpson discloses various features of a cell phone rather than a cell phone coupled

P16793

PATENT

to a personal data processing device. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Simpson does not teach or suggest the claimed element of “retrieving information in addition to a caller ID associated with the incoming call”. Instead, Simpson merely describes retrieval of a caller ID and no other information. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that George does not overcome the shortcomings of Simpson because George also does not disclose retrieving information in addition to a caller id associated with an incoming call or a system wherein a cell phone is coupled to a personal data processing device where the personal data processing device is capable of receiving a signal from the cell phone to notify the data processing device of incoming calls. Instead, as the Examiner highlighted in George, “George teaches a detection of an alert from an incoming call while user is on the computer, where the computer is connected to the server 115.” The server in George appears to be a critical component of the system described in George. Specifically, the server provides the computer with a notification of an incoming call, and the server provides the user with communications management options (George Col. 5, lines 43-50 and Col. 7, lines 43-50). Thus George clearly does not describe the claimed element of “receiving notification of the incoming call on a personal data processing device external to the cell phone, the notification including a signal from the cell phone”, as claimed.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that the combination of Simpson and George does not teach or suggest all the elements of the independent claims. More specifically, as previously discussed, Simpson does not teach various elements of the independent claims and the combination of George with Simpson does not overcome this problem. Since the dependent claims incorporate all the limitations of the independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Simpson and George also does not render the dependent claims unpatentable. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection to Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

P16793

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that pending Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26 and 28 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this case. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (714) 669-1261.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2006

/Sharmini N. Green/
Sharmini N. Green
Senior Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 41,410
(714) 669-1261